

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

---

CORE WIRELESS S.A.R.L.,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

---

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

CASE NO. 6:12-CV-100-JRG

**ORDER**

The Court held a hearing on July 6, 2015, regarding the following post-trial motions by Plaintiff Core Wireless S.A.R.L. (“Core Wireless”) and Defendant Apple, Inc. (“Apple”): Apple’s Motion to Lift Stay and for Dismissal and/or Summary Judgment on Core Wireless’s Portfolio Contract and Unjust Enrichment Claims (Dkt. No. 440), Apple’s Motion for Attorneys’ Fees and for Bill of Costs (Dkt. No. 441), Apple’s Post-Verdict Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law of Invalidity, or in Alternative, a New Trial on Invalidity (Dkt. No. 442), Core Wireless’s Renewed Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law as to Non-Infringement and Motion for New Trial (Dkt. No. 443), and Core Wireless’s Motion for New Trial on Non-Infringement (Dkt. No. 444). This Order summarizes and memorializes the Court’s rulings on the following motions:


- (1) After considering the parties’ briefing and the evidence presented at trial, Core Wireless’s Renewed Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law as to Non-Infringement and Motion for New Trial (Dkt. No. 443) and Core Wireless’s Motion for New Trial on Non-Infringement (Dkt. No. 444) are **DENIED**. The Court finds the verdict is supported by substantial evidence, and the Court finds

nothing in the controlling law which compels that the verdict be set aside in this regard.

(2) As Apple's Post-Verdict Motion for JMOL of Invalidity, or in Alternative, a New Trial on Invalidity (Dkt. No. 442) was conditional upon the Court granting either judgment as a matter of law or new trial as to the issue of non-infringement, (*see* Dkt. No. 442, at 1). This condition has not been met. Consequently, Apple's Motion (Dkt. No. 442) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

The Court reserves the option, at a later date and within the Court's discretion, to supplement and/or replace this order with an opinion containing a more detailed analysis in regard to the above ruling.

**So ORDERED and SIGNED this 11th day of August, 2015.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
RODNEY GILSTRAP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE